



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,733	04/04/2001	Gerard Pallipuram	PALM-3599.US.P	6062
7590	08/13/2004		EXAMINER	
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP Two North Market Street, Third Floor San Jose, CA 95113				MAURO JR, THOMAS J
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2143

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/826,733	PALLIPURAM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Thomas J. Mauro Jr.	2143		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are pending and are presented for examination. A formal action on the merits of claims 1-26 follows.

Drawings

2. Figures 3-5 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. Hand-held personal digital assistant (PDA) is prior art and well known at the time of the applicant's invention and thus should be labeled as prior art. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 21 and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities: Please refrain from referring to a previous step using "...after said step d)." Please correct by writing out limitations for clarity. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig (U.S. 6,654,785) in view of Carini et al. (U.S. 6,636,873).

Regarding claim 1, Craig teaches a communication system comprising:

a server device comprising client software, said client software comprising instructions for performing a synchronization compliant with said server [Craig --
Figure 3 Col. 9 lines 10-15 and lines 46-51 and Col. 10 lines 13-19 – Server stores applets, i.e. client software, which allow synchronization between the various students, i.e. clients, with the instructor]; and

a first client device for performing data processing functions, said first client device for establishing a communication link with said server [Craig -- **Figures 1, 3 and 4, Col. 9 lines 10-12 and Col. 14 lines 35-43 – First client establishes a session connection with a socket on a server, i.e. establishes a communication link**], for

receiving a copy of said client software from said server in response to said communication link being established [Craig -- **Col. 8 lines 46-51, Col. 9 lines 10-15 and Col. 13 lines 44-47 – Student, i.e. client, receives copy of client software, i.e. applet from a web server once a communication link with the server has been established**], and for using said client software to perform a synchronization with said

server to obtain a portion of said information [**Craig -- Col. 7 lines 52-55, Col. 8 lines 17-20, Col. 9 lines 58-67 – Col. 10 lines 1-2 and lines 32-39 – Applets are used to perform information synchronizations between students and instructors**].

Craig fails to explicitly teach a database containing information.

Carini, however, discloses a computer system for synchronizing devices with a remote enterprise database [**Carini -- Col. 5 lines 4-7 and lines 61-66**].

Both Craig and Carini teach systems for synchronizing various computers with information from other computers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the remote enterprise database, as taught by Carini into the invention of Craig, in order to provide a well-known data structure for holding and storing data for users and for the synchronization process.

Regarding claim 2, Craig-Carini teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including wherein said first client device erases said client software after said synchronization is performed [**Craig -- Col. 12 lines 35-40, Col. 13 lines 2-5 and Col. 14 lines 42-43 – Upon termination from lecture server, student applet is first stopped by the stop () function and then erased from memory by running the destroy () function, thus removing all client software associated with lecture once student disconnects, i.e. browses to a different website, closes browser, etc., from lecture, i.e. web, server**].

Regarding claim 3, Craig-Carini teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 2 above, including wherein said first client device comprises a display screen and wherein said first client device is also for displaying said portion of said information on said display screen [**Craig -- Figure 1, Col. 7 lines 2-40 and lines 62-67 and Col. 8 lines 46-51 – Client devices include computers having a display device, i.e. monitor, which displays browser, i.e. GUI, and data received by the browser on the screen for users to view lecture slides**].

Regarding claim 4, Craig-Carini teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 3 above, including wherein said first client device erases, i.e. removes, said portion of said information [**Craig -- Col. 12 lines 35-40, Col. 13 lines 2-5 and Col. 14 lines 42-43 – Upon termination from lecture server, student applet is first stopped by the stop () function and then erased from memory by running the destroy () function, thus removing all client software associated with lecture once student disconnects, i.e. browses to a different website, closes browser, etc., from lecture server. Once browser is closed or new site is navigated to and applet is removed, so too is the information, i.e. slides**].

Regarding claim 5, Craig-Carini teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including wherein said synchronization comprises a query command [**Craig -- Col. 11 line 67 – Col. 12 lines 1-11 – Once connection is established with lecture server, query command is attempted instructing the applet to synchronize lecture with the current slide**].

Regarding claim 6, Craig-Carini teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including further comprising a second client device for performing data processing functions, said second client device for establishing a communication link with said server **[Craig -- Figures 1, 3 and 4, Col. 9 lines 10-12, Col. 9 lines 65-67 – Col. 10 lines 1-2 and Col. 14 lines 35-43 – Second client, i.e. out of many client machines in a multi-student lecture, establishes a session connection with a socket on a server, i.e. establishes a communication link]**, for receiving a copy of said client software from said server in response to said communication link being established between said second client device **[Craig -- Col. 8 lines 46-51, Col. 9 lines 10-15 and Col. 13 lines 44-47 – Student, i.e. client, receives copy of client software, i.e. applet from a web server once a communication link with the server has been established]**, and for using said client software to perform a synchronization with said server to obtain a portion of said information **[Craig -- Col. 7 lines 52-55, Col. 8 lines 17-20, Col. 9 lines 58-67 – Col. 10 lines 1-2 and lines 32-39 – Applets are used to perform information synchronizations between students and instructors]**.

Regarding claims 7 and 8, these are system claims similar in limitation to the system claimed in claims 2 and 3 above. Therefore, claims 7 and 8 are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 9, Craig-Carini teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, wherein said first client device is a portable computer

system [**Craig -- Figure 1 and Col. 7 lines 6-8 – Portable computer systems include laptops which are shown in Figure 1**] and wherein said server is a web server [**Craig -- Figure 1, Col. 7 lines 41-55 and Col. 9 lines 39-41 – System is implemented using a web server**].

Regarding claim 10, Craig teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a web server [**Craig -- Figure 1, Col. 7 lines 41-55 and Col. 9 lines 39-41 – System is implemented using a web server**], but fails to teach wherein said first client device is a wireless telephone device.

Carini, however, discloses a computer system for synchronizing devices wherein the devices are web-enabled phones, i.e. wireless telephones, and personal digital assistants (PDA's) [**Carini -- Figure 4, Col. 3 lines 8-11 and lines 24-30 and Col. 5 lines 9-16**].

Both Craig and Carini teach systems for synchronizing various computers with information from other computers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the various mobile devices, including web-enabled phones, i.e. wireless telephones, and PDA's, as taught by Carini into the invention of Craig, in order to allow potentially geographically disseminated and disconnected users to synchronize the data stored on their mobile devices [**Carini -- Col. 2 lines 58-62**].

Regarding claims 11-20, these are method claims corresponding to the system claimed in claims 1-10 above. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 11-20 are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 21, Craig teaches a communication system comprising a plurality of client devices and a server, a method of communicating comprising the steps of:

- a) a server device comprising client software, said client software comprising instructions for performing a synchronization compliant with said server **[Craig – Figures 1 and 3, Col. 9 lines 10-15 and lines 46-51 and Col. 10 lines 13-19 – Server stores applets, i.e. client software, which allow synchronization between the various students, i.e. clients, with the instructor];**
- b) a portable computer system establishing a communication link with said server **[Craig -- Figures 1, 3 and 4, Col. 7 lines 6-8, Col. 9 lines 10-12 and Col. 14 lines 35-43 – First client on a portable computer system, i.e. laptop, establishes a session connection with a socket on a server, i.e. establishes a communication link];**
- c) said portable computer system receiving a copy of said client software from said server in response to said communication link being established **[Craig -- Col. 8 lines 46-51, Col. 9 lines 10-15 and Col. 13 lines 44-47 – Student, i.e. client, receives copy of client software, i.e. applet from a web server once a communication link with the server has been established];**
- d) said portable computer system using said client software to perform a synchronization with said server to obtain a first portion of said information **[Craig -- Col. 7 lines 52-55, Col. 8 lines 17-20, Col. 9 lines 58-67 – Col. 10 lines 1-2 and lines 32-39 – Applets are used to perform information synchronizations between students and instructors]; and**

e) said portable computer system erasing said client software after said portable computer system uses said client software to perform a synchronization with said server [**Craig -- Col. 12 lines 35-40, Col. 13 lines 2-5 and Col. 14 lines 42-43 – Upon termination from lecture server, student applet is first stopped by the stop () function and then erased from memory by running the destroy () function, thus removing all client software associated with lecture once student disconnects, i.e. browses to a different website, closes browser, etc., from lecture server**].

Craig fails to explicitly teach a database containing information.

Carini, however, discloses a computer system for synchronizing devices with a remote enterprise database [**Carini -- Col. 5 lines 4-7 and lines 61-66**].

Both Craig and Carini teach systems for synchronizing various computers with information from other computers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the remote enterprise database, as taught by Carini into the invention of Craig, in order to provide a well-known data structure for holding and storing data for users and for the synchronization process.

Regarding claim 22, Craig teaches the invention substantially as claimed including the steps of:

f) a device establishing a communication link with said server [**Craig -- Figures 1, 3 and 4, Col. 9 lines 10-12 and Col. 14 lines 35-43 – First client establishes a session connection with a socket on a server, i.e. establishes a communication link**];

g) said device receiving a copy of said client software from said server in response to said communication link being established [**Craig -- Col. 8 lines 46-51, Col. 9 lines 10-15 and Col. 13 lines 44-47 – Student, i.e. client, receives copy of client software, i.e. applet from a web server once a communication link with the server has been established**].

h) said device using said client software to perform a synchronization with said server to obtain a second portion of said information [**Craig -- Col. 7 lines 52-55, Col. 8 lines 17-20, Col. 9 lines 58-67 – Col. 10 lines 1-2 and lines 32-39 – Applets are used to perform information synchronizations between students and instructors, i.e. to synchronize lecture slides and other information**]; and

i) said device erasing said client software after said device uses said client software to perform a synchronization with said server [**Craig -- Col. 12 lines 35-40, Col. 13 lines 2-5 and Col. 14 lines 42-43 – Upon termination from lecture server, student applet is first stopped by the stop () function and then erased from memory by running the destroy () function, thus removing all client software associated with lecture once student disconnects, i.e. browses to a different website, closes browser, etc., from lecture server**].

Craig fails to explicitly teach wherein the device is a wireless phone.

Carini, however, discloses a computer system for synchronizing devices wherein the devices are web-enabled phones, i.e. wireless telephones, and personal digital assistants (PDA's) [**Carini -- Figure 4, Col. 3 lines 8-11 and lines 24-30 and Col. 5 lines 9-16**].

Both Craig and Carini teach systems for synchronizing various computers with information from other computers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the various mobile devices, including web-enabled phones, i.e. wireless telephones, and PDA's, as taught by Carini into the invention of Craig, in order to allow potentially geographically disseminated and disconnected users to synchronize the data stored on their mobile devices **[Carini -- Col. 2 lines 58-62]**.

Regarding claim 23, Craig-Carini teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 21 above, including wherein said server is a web server **[Craig - - Figure 1, Col. 7 lines 41-55 and Col. 9 lines 39-41 – System is implemented using a web server]**.

Regarding claim 24, Craig-Carini teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 21 above, including wherein said server is an enterprise server **[Carini -- Figure 4 and Col. 5 lines 4-16 and lines 61-66 – Enterprise database would obviously reside on an enterprise server]**.

Regarding claim 25, Craig-Carini teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 21 above, including wherein said portable computer system is a laptop **[Craig -- Figure 1 and Col. 7 lines 6-8 – Portable computer systems include laptops which are shown in Figure 1]**.

Regarding claim 26, Craig-Carini teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 21 above, including wherein said portable computer system is a

hand-held personal digital assistant (PDA) [Carini -- Figure 4, Col. 3 lines 8-11 and lines 24-30 and Col. 5 lines 9-16 – Mobile devices include PDA’s].

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Huang et al. (U.S. 6,477,543) disclose a system and method for improving the synchronization ability between a client device and an Internet appliance.
- Bodnar et al. (U.S. 6,295,541) discloses a system for synchronizing data sets using a distributed synchronization system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 703-605-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TJM

August 6, 2004



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100